

Item 25



Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

Meeting Date: April 23, 2013

Prepared By/Phone Number: Jorge Talavera, CPPO, CPPB/854-9762;
Marvin Brice, CPPB/854-9765

Elected/Appointed Official/Dept. Head: Cyd Grimes, C.P.M., CPPO

Commissioners Court Sponsor: Judge Biscoe

Agenda Language: Authorize Purchasing Agent to commence negotiations with the highest-ranked firm after interviews for RFS No. S1301-008-CG, Program Manager/Owner's Representative for Development of a New Travis County Civil and Family Courthouse

- **Purchasing Recommendation and Comments:** Purchasing concurs with departments and recommends approval of requested action. This procurement action meets the compliance requirements as outlined by the statutes.
- In December 2010, the County purchased the full city block located at 308 Guadalupe for the development of a new Travis County Civil and Family Courthouse to replace the aging and outdated Heman Marion Sweatt Courthouse. On April 22, 2011, Request for Information (RFI) No. I041311CG was issued, as directed by the Commissioners Court, to solicit information from developers and construction teams to explore the potential for a public-private-partnership (P3) for the development of the new courthouse building. The intent of the P3 project delivery method would be to reduce Travis County's cost and to deliver the project more quickly and with quality long-term design, construction, maintenance, and/or operations of the new courthouse building. In response to the RFI, on June 30, 2011, twenty-one (21) responses were received from various companies and consortiums which provided information on their past experience with, and ideas on, the P3 contracting approach, and expressed an interest in participating in the County's project in some capacity.
- On May 31, 2011, the Purchasing Agent was authorized to issue Request for Services (RFS) No. S110505-CG to procure the services of an Advisory Team to assist in determining the feasibility of utilizing a P3 delivery method (and other alternative project delivery methods) for the

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a pdf to agenda@co.travis.tx.us by Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m. for the next week's meeting.

development of the new courthouse building. As a result, contract PS120059JT was awarded on January 3, 2012, to Ernst & Young LLP (and associated legal services were awarded to Hawkins, Delafield & Wood). Ernst & Young presented a summary of their findings on April, 3, 2012, which included an analysis of the financial feasibility of various delivery options for the Courthouse, an update on project costs and a value-for-money analysis of a design-build (DB) and or a public-private-partnership (P3) delivery as compared to a traditional design-bid-build (DBB) process. The report concluded that there is value-for-money in pursuing an alternative delivery method instead of the traditional DBB approach. In May 2012, the Court appointed members to a Travis County Civil and Family Courthouse Recommendation Committee to assist with the selection of a final delivery method for the project. Upon completion of their work, the Committee presented their report for the Court's consideration and deliberation on August 7, 2012. The Committee's report recommended that the Court pursue a P3 delivery approach for the project and included several other recommendations, including the need to hire a transaction-oriented P3 advisory team before issuing a solicitation for the development of the project.

- As the next recommended step required to advance toward the development of the new courthouse building, the County issued subject RFS on February 13, 2013, to procure the services of a Program Manager/Owner's Representative to advise the Commissioners Court, and represent the County's interests, through the development of the new Civil and Family Courthouse.
- Phase one of the services to be contracted will require the selected team to review and analyze the information prepared to date, assist with finalizing a financing strategy, advise the County in the selection of the best project delivery approach to be used for the project (DB or P3) and perform other tasks consistent with this stage of the project. Future phases of the project will require the team to provide procurement assistance, contract negotiation and program management services. Once a project delivery method is selected by the Commissioners Court, an item will be put before voters in an upcoming bond election for approval. If approved by voters, the County will subsequently begin the required solicitations to move forward with development and construction of the new courthouse building.

Evaluation Matrix for RFS No. S1301-008-CG, Program Manager/Owner's Representative for Development of a New Travis County Civil and Family Courthouse - COMPILED SCORES																
Evaluator No. 1		APSI Construction Management		Broaddus & Associates		CBRE		Ernst & Young LLP		Muñoz & Company		PTP Infrastructure, LLC		URS Corporation		Avg. Score
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed. Key personnel shall have previous experience in dealing with development of major construction projects for a public entity.	30%	5	1.50	5	1.50	5	1.50	5	1.50	5	1.50	2	0.60	4	1.20	1.33
2. CRITERION TWO: Fee Proposal (Calculated by Purchasing)																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	30%	3	0.90	2.5	0.75	4	1.20	3	0.90	3	0.90	1	0.30	2.5	0.75	0.81
3. CRITERION THREE: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	20%	5	1.00	5	1.00	5	1.00	5	1.00	4	0.80	2	0.40	4	0.80	0.86
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	5	1.00	5	1.00	4	0.80	5	1.00	5	1.00	2	0.40	4	0.80	0.86
TOTAL SCORE	100%		4.40		4.25		4.50		4.40		4.20		1.70		3.55	3.86
Evaluator No. 2																
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed. Key personnel shall have previous experience in dealing with development of major construction projects for a public entity.	30%	2	0.60	5	1.50	2	0.60	4	1.20	4	1.20	2	0.60	4	1.20	0.99
2. CRITERION TWO: Fee Proposal (Calculated by Purchasing)																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	30%	3	0.90	2.5	0.75	4	1.20	3	0.90	3	0.90	1	0.30	2.5	0.75	0.81
3. CRITERION THREE: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	20%	2	0.40	5	1.00	2	0.40	3	0.60	4	0.80	2	0.40	4	0.80	0.63
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	4	0.80	2	0.40	3	0.60	3	0.60	1	0.20	3	0.60	0.51
TOTAL SCORE	100%		2.30		4.05		2.60		3.30		3.50		1.50		3.35	2.94
Evaluator No. 3																
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed. Key personnel shall have previous experience in dealing with development of major construction projects for a public entity.	30%	2.5	0.75	5	1.50	3	0.90	4	1.20	2.5	0.75	2	0.60	4.5	1.35	1.01
2. CRITERION TWO: Fee Proposal (Calculated by Purchasing)																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	30%	3	0.90	2.5	0.75	4	1.20	3	0.90	3	0.90	1	0.30	2.5	0.75	0.81
3. CRITERION THREE: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	20%	2.5	0.50	5	1.00	3	0.60	4	0.80	2.5	0.50	2	0.40	4.5	0.90	0.67
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	4	0.80	2.5	0.50	4	0.80	3	0.60	2	0.40	4	0.80	0.61
TOTAL SCORE	100%		2.55		4.05		3.20		3.70		2.75		1.70		3.80	3.11
Evaluator No. 4																
Criteria	Weighted Factor	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Raw Score	Total Score	Avg. Score
1. CRITERION ONE: Demonstrated Expertise of Personnel																
Demonstrated expertise and experience of key personnel proposed to provide the services proposed. Key personnel shall have previous experience in dealing with development of major construction projects for a public entity.	30%	3	0.90	4	1.20	3	0.90	3.5	1.05	3	0.90	2	0.60	5	1.50	1.01
2. CRITERION TWO: Fee Proposal (Calculated by Purchasing)																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	30%	3	0.90	2.5	0.75	4	1.20	3	0.90	3	0.90	1	0.30	2.5	0.75	0.81
3. CRITERION THREE: Demonstrated Experience of the Firm																
Demonstrated experience of the firm in providing similar consulting services on comparable projects.	20%	2	0.40	4	0.80	3	0.60	4	0.80	3	0.60	2	0.40	4	0.80	0.63
4. CRITERION FOUR: Proposed Approach to Providing Services																
Respondent must have adequate current full-time staff, both registered professionals in an applicable field and technical and administrative support staff, to competently and efficiently perform the work. Respondent must submit a management plan to show how it proposes to efficiently accomplish the work for the Project under consideration. Each phase of the plan should have a well-defined scope, deliverables, and estimated timeframe for completion.	20%	2	0.40	4.5	0.90	4	0.80	4.5	0.90	3	0.60	2	0.40	4.5	0.90	0.70
TOTAL SCORE	100%		2.60		3.65		3.50		3.65		3.00		1.70		3.95	3.15
TOTAL SCORE AVERAGE																
			2.96		4.00		3.45		3.76		3.36		1.65		3.66	3.26

Final Ranking, RFS No. S1301-008-CG

	Broaddus & Associates	Ernst & Young LLP	URS Corporation
Evaluator #1	2	3	1
Evaluator #2	2	3	1
Evaluator #3	2	3	1
Evaluator #4	2	3	1
Evaluator #5	2	3	1
Total No. 1 Votes			5